From: Damien Houlihan
To: Houlihan, Damien
Subject: Fw: MT Tom BA Questions #5 and #13
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 8:53:48 AM
Attachments: CW Discharge Sheet Piling.pdf

Damien Houlihan, Chief
Industrial Permits Section
Office of Ecosystem Protection
US EPA

(617) 918-1586
----- Forwarded by Damien Houlihan/R1/USEPA/US on 06/19/2013 08:53 AM -----

From: John Nagle/R1/USEPA/US
To: Christine Vaccaro <christine.vaccaro@noaa.gov>
Date: 07/19/2012 05:39 PM
Subject: MT Tom BA Questions #5 and #13

Hi Chris:

This information in the attached e-mail and file should address part of Question #5

5) The man-made wall channels heated effluent into the river for mixing--how far does the plume extend beyond the wall before ambient temperature (or at least within the WQS range) is reached? Does this occur in the river where fish could have contact with the plume, or is the WQS reached at the end of the wall before fish/larvae, etc. could have contact with the plume? 330 feet is mentioned at one point, but is the wall this long? Please elaborate.

Also, regarding Question #13

13) Please provide an analysis on the effects of the currently used electric-fish barrier on shortnose sturgeon, since this is the currently used method to reduce impingement at the station.

Based on the assessment of the electric barrier (see reference below), the electric barrier is no longer used at Mt Tom Station. I do not think we included this technology in the BA. If we did, it was an error.

5.9 Electric Barrier
Data collected to assess the effectiveness of the electric barrier at Mt. Tom indicate that the barrier is likely not affecting impingement rates. On four of the paired sampling days, no fish were impinged at all, however on those days when fish were present for at least one of the sampling events, impingement observations were greater on the days when the barrier was on (Table 11). Only two fish were collected on the eight
days that the barrier was turned off, as compared to the collection of nine fish on the previous days when the barrier remained on. EPRI (1999) reports that electric barriers are not biologically effective and have not shown to be successful in reducing impingement impacts. (Taken from FIRSTLIGHT POWER RESOURCES SEVICES, LLC, MT. TOM

GENERATING STATION, *PERMIT ID #MA0005339,* IMPINGEMENT REPORT, *DECEMBER 2008, Prepared by: Kleinschmidt)*

Also, I am trying to answer questions and get you the information as time allows. If this approach is confusing, and you would rather I not send any information until all 13 questions are addressed, I will stop sending the information in smaller batches.

Let me know what you think.

Thanks,

JHN

John H. Nagle
Biologist / Environmental Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
New England Region I
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code OEP06-1
Boston, MA 02109 - 3912
(617) 918-1054 (phone)
(617) 918-1505 (fax)
nagle.john@epa.gov (e-mail)

From: Gwyther, Mike [mailto:Mike.Gwyther@gdfsuezna.com]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2012 10:14 AM
Cc: Merchant, Richard; Merchant, James; Maggiani, Robert K
Subject: RE: Question from EPA

The sheet pilings extend out about 18' with a 30' radius sweep and then extend 90' downstream for a total length of about 115'. I've attached a couple of scans from the drawing.

Mike Gwyther
Plant Manager
Mt. Tom Generating Station

413-536-9562 office

(See attached file: CW Discharge Sheet Piling.pdf)